Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan of Fermi Research Alliance, LLC

for the

Management and Operations of the Fermi National Acceleratory Laboratory

FY 2009

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

FERMI SITE OFFICE

INTRODUCTION

This document, the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP), primarily serves as DOE's Quality Assurance/Surveillance Plan (QASP) for the evaluation of Fermi Research Alliance, LLC (hereafter referred to as "the Contractor") performance regarding the management and operations of the Fermi National Acceleratory Laboratory (hereafter referred to as "the Laboratory") for the evaluation period from October 1, 2008, through September 30, 2009. The performance evaluation provides a standard by which to determine whether the Contractor is managerially and operationally in control of the Laboratory and is meeting the mission requirements and performance expectations/objectives of the Department as stipulated within this contract.

This document also describes the distribution of the total available performance-based fee and the methodology for determining the amount of fee earned by the Contractor as stipulated within the clauses entitled, "Determining Total Available Performance Fee and Fee Earned," "Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, or Incentives," and "Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount." In partnership with the Contractor and other key customers, the Department of Energy (DOE) Headquarters (HQ) and the Site Office have defined the measurement basis that serves as the Contractor's performance-based evaluation and fee determination. The available fee the Laboratory is eligible to earn during the evaluation period is $3,550,000.00.

The Performance Goals (hereafter referred to as Goals), Performance Objectives (hereafter referred to as Objectives) and set of Performance Measures and Targets (hereafter referred to as Performance Measures/Targets) for each Objective discussed herein were developed in accordance with contract expectations set forth within the contract. The Performance Measures for meeting the Objectives set forth within this plan have been developed in coordination with HQ program offices as appropriate. Except as otherwise provided for within the contract, the evaluation and fee determination will rest solely on the Contractor's performance within the Performance Goals and Objectives set forth within this plan.

The overall performance against each Objective of this performance plan, to include the evaluation of Performance Measures identified for each Objective, shall be evaluated jointly by the appropriate HQ office or major customer and the Site Office. This cooperative review methodology will ensure that the overall evaluation of the Contractor results in a consolidated DOE position taking into account specific Performance Measures as well as all additional information not otherwise identified via specific Performance Measures. The Site Office shall work closely with each HQ program office or major customer throughout the year in evaluating the Contractor's performance and will provide observations regarding programs and projects as well as other management and operation activities conducted by the Contractor throughout the year.

Section I provides information on how the performance rating (grade) for the Contractor, as well as how the performance-based fee earned (if any) will be determined. As applicable, also provides information on the award term eligibility requirements.

Section II provides the detailed information concerning each Goal, their corresponding Objectives, and Performance Measures of performance identified, along with the weightings assigned to each Goal and Objective and a table for calculating the final score for each Goal.

I. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE RATING, PERFORMANCE-BASED FEE AND AWARD TERM ELIGIBILITY (as applicable)

The FY 2009 Contractor performance grades for each Goal will be determined based on the weighted sum of the individual scores earned for each of the Objectives described within this document for Science and Technology and for Management and Operations. No overall rollup grade will be provided. The rollup of the performance of each Goal will then be utilized to determine the overall Contractor performance score for Science and Technology and Management and Operations (see Table A below). The total overall score derived for Science and Technology will be utilized to determine the amount of available fee that may be earned (see Table C). The overall score derived for Management and Operations will be utilized to determine the multiplier to be applied (see Table C) to the Science and Technology fee earned to determine the final amount of fee earned for FY 2009. Each Goal is composed of two or more weighted Objectives and each Objective has a set of Performance Measures, which are identified to assist the reviewer in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the Performance Measures identifies significant activities, requirements, and/or milestones important to the success of the corresponding Objective and shall be utilized as the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting the Objective. Although the Performance Measures are the primary means for determining performance, other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources to include, but not limited to, the Contractor's self-evaluation report, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and the annual 2-week review (if needed), may be utilized in determining the Contractor's overall success in meeting an Objective. The following describes the methodology for determining the Contractor's grade for each Goal:

Performance Evaluation Methodology:
The purpose of this section is to establish a methodology to develop scoring at the Objective Level. Each Objective within a Goal shall be assigned a numerical score, per Figure I-1 below, by the evaluating office. Each evaluation will measure the degree of effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in meeting the Objective and shall be based on the Contractor's success in meeting the set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective as well as other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources as identified above. The set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective represents the set of significant indicators that if fully met, collectively places performance for the Objective in the "B+" grade range. For some targets, it serves the evaluator to provide additional grading details (for example at the A, C+, and D levels) and in those cases details have been included in the PEMP. However, these should be considered as guidelines that do not restrict the evaluation from considering other factors that contribute to the evaluation.

Letter Grade	Numeric Grade	Definition
A+	4.3 – 4.1	Significantly exceeds expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective or within other areas within the purview of the Objective. Areas of notable performance have or have the potential to significantly improve the overall mission of the Laboratory. No specific deficiency noted within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated.
A	4.0 – 3.8	Notably exceeds expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective or within other areas within the purview of the Objective. Areas of notable performance either have or have the potential to improve the overall mission of the Laboratory. Minor deficiencies noted are more than offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated and have no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
A-	3.7 – 3.5	Meets expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective with some notable areas of increased performance identified. Deficiencies noted are offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated with little or no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B+	3.4 – 3.1	Meets expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective with no notable areas of increased or diminished performance identified. Deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B	3.0 – 2.8	Most expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective are met and/or other minor deficiencies are identified. Performance measures or other minor deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance within the purview of the Objective and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B-	2.7 – 2.5	One or two expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and/or other deficiencies are identified and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C+	2.4 – 2.1	Some expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and/or other minor deficiencies are identified and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C	2.0 – 1.8	A number of expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or a number of other deficiencies are identified and although they may be somewhat offset by other positive performance, they have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.

Letter Grade	Numeric Grade	Definition
C-	1.7 – 1.1	Most expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other major deficiencies are identified which have or will negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment if not immediately corrected.
D	1.0 – 0.8	Most or all expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the Objective and/or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
F	0.7 – 0	All expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have significantly impacted both the Objective and the accomplishment of the Laboratory mission.

Figure I-1. Letter Grade and Numerical Score Definitions

Calculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grade:
Each Objective is assigned the earned numerical score by the evaluating office as stated above. The Goal rating is then computed by multiplying the numerical score by the weight of each Objective within a Goal. These values are then added together to develop an overall score for each Goal. For the purpose of determining the final Goal grade, the raw numerical score for each Goal will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point utilizing the standard rounding convention discussed below and then compared to Table B. A set of tables is provided at the end of each Performance Goal section of this document to assist in the calculation of Objective scores to the Goal score. Utilizing the raw numerical score for each Goal within Table A, below, the scores for each of the Science and Technology (S&T) Goals and Management and Operations (M&O) Goals are then multiplied by the weight assigned and these are summed to provide an overall raw score for each.

As stated above the raw score from each calculation shall be carried through to the next stage of the calculation process. The raw score for Science and Technology and Management and Operations will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point for purposes of determining fee as indicated in Table C. A standard rounding convention of x.44 and less rounds down to the nearest tenth (here, x.4), while x.45 and greater rounds up to the nearest tenth (here, x.50).

S&T Performance Goal	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight[1]	Weighted Score	Total Score
1.0 Mission Accomplishment			25%		
2.0 Construction and Operations of User Research Facilities and Equipment			50%		
3.0 Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management			25%		
				Total Score	
M&O Performance Goal	**Numerical Score**	**Letter Grade**	**Weight**	**Weighted Score**	**Total Score**
4.0 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory			25%		
5.0 Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection			25%		
6.0 Business Systems			25%		
7.0 Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio			15%		
8.0 Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems			10%		
				Total Score	

Table A. FY 2009 Contractor Evaluation Score Calculation

Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
Total Score	**4.3-4.1**	**4.0-3.8**	**3.7-3.5**	**3.4-3.1**	**3.0-2.8**	**2.7-2.5**	**2.4-2.1**	**2.0-1.8**	**1.7-1.1**	**1.0-0.8**	**0.7-0**

Table B. FY 2009 Contractor Letter Grade Scale

[1] Any weightings provided for each S&T Goal listed within Table A are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are shown for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining the overall S&T score will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

Determining the Amount of Performance-Based Fee Earned:
The percentage of the available performance-based fee that may be earned by the Contractor shall be determined based on the overall weighted score for the S&T Goals (see Table A. above) and then compared to Table C. below. The overall numerical score of the M&O Goals from Table A. above shall then be utilized to determine the final fee multiplier (see Table C.), which shall be utilized to determine the overall amount of performance-based fee earned for FY 2009 as calculated within Table D.

Overall Weighted Score from Table A.	Percent S&T Fee Earned	M&O Fee Multiplier
4.3	100%	100%
4.2		
4.1		
4.0	97%	100%
3.9		
3.8		
3.7	94%	100%
3.6		
3.5		
3.4	91%	100%
3.3		
3.2		
3.1		
3.0	88%	95%
2.9		
2.8		
2.7	85%	90%
2.6		
2.5		
2.4	75%	85%
2.3		
2.2		
2.1		
2.0	50%	75%
1.9		
1.8		
1.7	0%	60%
1.6		
1.5		
1.4		
1.3		
1.2		
1.1		
1.0 to 0.8	0%	0%
0.7 to 0.0	0%	0%

Table C. - Performance-Based Fee Earned Scale

Overall Fee Determination	
Percent S&T Fee Earned from Table C.	
M&O Fee Multiplier from Table C.	**X**
Overall Earned Performance-Based Fee	

Table D. – Final Percentage of Performance-Based Fee Earned Determination

Adjustment to the Letter Grade and/or Performance-Based Fee Determination:
The lack of performance objectives and measures in this plan do not diminish the need to comply with minimum contractual requirements. Although the performance-based Goals and their corresponding Objectives shall be the primary means utilized in determining the Contractor's performance grade and/or amount of performance-based fee earned, the Contracting Officer may unilaterally adjust the rating and/or reduce the otherwise earned fee based on the Contractor's performance against all contract requirements as set forth in the Prime Contract. While reductions may be based on performance against any contract requirement, specific note should be made to contract clauses which address reduction of fee including, Standards of Contractor Performance Evaluation, DEAR 970.5215-1 – Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount, and Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives – Facility Management Contracts. Data to support rating and/or fee adjustments may be derived from other sources to include, but not limited to, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and the annual 2-week review (if needed).

The adjustment of a grade and/or reduction of otherwise earned fee will be determined by the severity of the performance failure and consideration of mitigating factors. DEAR 970.5215-3 Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives – Facility Management Contracts is the mechanism used for reduction of fee as it relates to performance failures related to safeguarding of classified information and to adequate protection of environment, health and safety. Its guidance can also serve as an example for reduction of fee in other areas.

The final Contractor performance-based grades for each Goal and fee earned determination will be contained within a year-end report, documenting the results from the DOE review. The report will identify areas where performance improvement is necessary and, if required, provide the basis for any performance-based rating and/or fee adjustments made from the otherwise earned rating/fee based on Performance Goal achievements.

Determining Award Term Eligibility:
The base term of the Prime Contract is five years. The Prime Contract contains a non-monetary performance incentive, in Section F "Deliveries or Performance" at Clause F.2. "Award Term Incentive (Special)", which will allow the contractor to earn up to an additional fifteen years of Prime Contract term for exemplary performance.

II. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES & PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Background

The current performance-based management approach to oversight within DOE has established a new culture within the Department with emphasis on the customer-supplier partnership between DOE and the laboratory contractors. It has also placed a greater focus on mission performance, best business practices, cost management, and improved contractor accountability. Under the performance-based management system, the DOE provides clear direction to the laboratories and develops annual performance plans (such as this one) to assess the contractors performance in meeting that direction in accordance with contract requirements. The DOE policy for implementing performance-based management includes the following guiding principles:

- Performance objectives are established in partnership with affected organizations and are directly aligned to the DOE strategic goals;
- Resource decisions and budget requests are tied to results; and
- Results are used for management information, establishing accountability, and driving long-term improvements.

The performance-based approach focuses the evaluation of the Contractor's performance against these Performance Goals. Progress against these Goals is measured through the use of a set of Objectives. The success of each Objective will be measured based on a set of Performance Measures, both objective and subjective, that are to focus primarily on end-results or impact and not on processes or activities. Measures provide specific evidence of performance, and collectively, they provide the body of evidence that indicates performance relative to the corresponding Objectives. On occasion however, it may be necessary to include a process/activity-oriented measure when there is a need for the Contractor to develop a system or process that does not currently exist but will be of significant importance to the DOE and the Laboratory when completed or that lead to the desired outcome/result.

Performance Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures

The following sections describe the Performance Goals, their supporting Objectives, and associated performance measures for FY 2009.

1.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment

The Contractor produces high-quality, original, and creative results that advance science and technology; demonstrates sustained scientific progress and impact; receives appropriate external recognition of accomplishments; and contributes to overall research and development goals of the Department and its customers.

The weight of this Goal is 25%.

The Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment Goal measures the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in delivering science and technology results which contribute to and enhance the DOE's mission of protecting our national and economic security by providing world-class scientific research capacity and advancing scientific knowledge by supporting world-class, peer-reviewed scientific results, which are recognized by others.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science Program Office as identified below. The overall Goal score from each Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 1.1). Weightings for each office below are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

- Office of Advanced Scientific Research (ASCR) (0.1%)
- Office of High Energy Physics (HEP) (99.8%)
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) (0.1%)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 1.2 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 1.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. Individual Program Office weightings for each of the Objectives identified below are provided within Table 1.1. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science Program Offices for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives, the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2009 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

Objectives:

1.1 Science and Technology Results Provide Meaningful Impact on the Field

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, peer reviews, Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The impact of publications on the field;
- Publication in journals outside the field indicating broad impact;
- Impact on DOE or other customer mission(s);
- Successful stewardship of mission-relevant research areas;
- Significant awards (R&D 100, FLC, Nobel Prizes, etc.);
- Invited talks, citations, making high-quality data available to the scientific community; and
- Development of tools and techniques that become standards or widely-used in the scientific community.

A to A+	Changes the way the research community thinks about a particular field; resolves critical questions and thus moves research areas forward; results generate huge interest/enthusiasm in the field.
B+	Impacts the community as expected. Strong peer review comments in all relevant areas.
B	Not strong peer review comments in at least one significant research area.
C	One research area just not working out. Peer review reveals that a program isn't going anywhere.
D	Failure of multiple program elements.
F	Gross scientific incompetence and/or scientific fraud.

1.2 Provided Quality Leadership in Science and Technology

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, peer reviews, Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Willingness to pursue novel approaches and/or demonstration of innovative solutions to problems;
- Willingness to take on high-risk/high payoff/long-term research problems, evidence that the Contractor "guessed right" in that previous risky decisions proved to be correct and are paying off;
- The uniqueness and challenge of science pursued, recognition for doing the best work in the field;
- Extent of collaborative efforts, quality of the scientists attracted and maintained at the Laboratory;
- Staff members visible in leadership position in the scientific community; and
- Effectiveness in driving the direction and setting the priorities of the community in a research field.

A to A+	Laboratory staff lead Academy or equivalent panels; laboratory's work changes the direction of research fields; world-class scientists are attracted to the laboratory, lab is trend-setter in a field.
B$^+$	Strong research performer in most areas; staff asked to speak to Academy or equivalent panels to discuss further research directions; lab is center for high-quality research and attracts full cadre of researchers; some aspects of programs are world-class.
B	Strong research performer in many areas; staff asked to speak to Academy or equivalent panels to discuss further research directions; few aspects of programs are world-class.
C	Working on problems no longer at the forefront of science; stale research; evolutionary, not revolutionary.
D	Failure of multiple program elements.
F	Gross scientific incompetence and/or scientific fraud.

1.3 Provide and Sustain Outputs that Advance Program Objectives and Goals

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through defined project products, progress reports, statements of work, program management plans, Program Office and/or other reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The quantity and quality of program/project (e.g., technical reports, policy papers, prototype demonstrations, tasks, etc.) output(s) be it policy, R&D, or implementation programs;
- The number of publications in peer-reviewed journals; and
- Demonstrated progress against peer-reviewed recommendations, headquarters guidance, etc.

A to A+	Program offices, clients, end-users, independent experts and/or peers laud work results; output(s) exceeds the amount and/or quality typically expected for an excellent body of work.
B$^+$	Program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews are universally positive; output(s) meet the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; work demonstrates progress against review recommendations and/or headquarters guidance.
B	Program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews are largely positive, with only a few minor deficiencies and/or slightly negative responses noted; minor deficiencies and/or negative responses have little to no potential to adversely impact the overall program/project.
C	A number of outputs have not met the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews identify a number of deficiencies and although they may be somewhat offset by other positive performance, they have the potential to negatively impact the overall program/project if not corrected.
D	Most outputs have not met the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews identify significant deficiencies which have negatively impacted

	the overall program/project.
F	All outputs have not met the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews identify significant deficiencies which have significantly impacted and/or damaged the overall program/project.

1.4 Provide for Effective Delivery of Products

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, peer reviews, Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Efficiency and effectiveness in meeting goals/milestones documented within FWPs and/or other such documents;
- Efficiency and effectiveness in delivering on promises, and/or getting instruments to work as promised; and
- Efficiency and effectiveness in transmitting results to the community and/or responding to DOE or other customer guidance.

A to A+	Program/project goals and/or milestones are met well ahead of schedule and/or well under budget; program/project and/or mission objectives(s) are fully met and results anticipate HQ guidance.
B^{+}	Program/project goals and/or milestones are primarily met on schedule and within budget; program/project and/or mission objective(s) are fully meet and are fully responsive to HQ guidance.
B	Most program/project goals and/or milestones are met on schedule and within budget; overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) are meet; minor delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are minimized and/or have little to no adverse impact the overall program/project.
C	A number of and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g. less than 6 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., less than 15% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met or have the potential to be missed; delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have the potential to adversely impact the overall program/project is not corrected.
D	Most of and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g. more than 6 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., less than 25% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met or have the potential to be missed; sizeable delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the overall program/project.
F	All and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g. more than 9 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., greater than 25% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met; significant delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the overall program/project.

Science Program Office[2]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research					
1.1 Impact			40%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall ASCR Total	
Office of High Energy Physics					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			20%		
1.4 Delivery			20%		
				Overall HEP Total	
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			30%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall WDTS Total	

Table 1.1 – 1.0 Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research			0.1%		
Office of High Energy Physics			99.8%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			0.1%		
				Performance Goal 1.0 Total	

Table 1.2 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development[3]

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 1.3 – 1.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

[2] A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Program is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

[3] Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 1.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance periods and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

2.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Research Facilities

The Contractor provides effective and efficient strategic planning; fabrication, construction and/or operations of Laboratory research facilities; and is responsive to the user community.

The weight of this Goal is 50%.

The Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Research Facilities Goal shall measure the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in planning for and delivering leading-edge specialty research and/or user facilities to ensure the required capabilities are present to meet today's and tomorrow's complex challenges. It also measures the Contractor's innovative operational and programmatic means for implementation of systems that ensures the availability, reliability, and efficiency of these facilities; and the appropriate balance between R&D and user support.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science Program Office as identified below. The overall Goal score from each Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 2.1). Weighting for each office listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. Final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

- Office of High Energy Physics (HEP) (100%)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by the office identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 2.2 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 2.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. Individual Program Office weightings for each of the Objectives identified below are provided within Table 2.1. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of High Energy Physics.

Objectives:

2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s) as Required to Support Laboratory Programs (i.e., activities leading up to CD-2)

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by scientific/technical workshops developing pre-conceptual R&D, progress reports, Lehman reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Effectiveness of planning of preconceptual R&D and design for life-cycle efficiency;
- Leverage of existing facilities at the site;
- Delivery of accurate and timely information needed to carry out the critical decision and budget formulation process; and
- Ability to meet the intent of DOE Order 413.3, Program and Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets.

A to A+	In addition to meeting all measures under B+, the laboratory is recognized by the research community as the leader for making the science case for the acquisition; Takes the initiative to demonstrate the potential for revolutionary scientific advancement. Identifies, analyzes and champions novel approaches for acquiring the new capability, including leveraging or extending the capability of existing facilities and financing. Proposed approaches are widely regarded as innovative, novel, comprehensive, and potentially cost-effective. Reviews repeatedly confirm potential for scientific discovery in areas that support the Department's mission, and potential to change a discipline or research area's direction.
B+	Provides the overall vision for the acquisition. Displays leadership and commitment to achieving the vision within preliminary estimates that are defensible and credible in terms of cost, schedule and performance; develops quality analyses, preliminary designs, and related documentation to support the approval of the mission need (CD-0), the alternative selection and cost range (CD-1) and the performance baseline (CD-2). Solves problems and addresses issues. Keeps DOE appraised of the status, near-term plans and the resolution of problems on a regular basis. Anticipates emerging issues that could impact plans and takes the initiative to inform DOE of possible consequences.
B	Fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	The laboratory team develops the required analyses and documentation in a timely manner. However, inputs are mundane and lack innovation and commitment to the vision of the acquisition.
D	The potential exists for credible science and business cases to be made for the acquisition, but the laboratory fails to take advantage of the opportunity.
F	Proposed approaches are based on fraudulent assumptions; the science case is weak to non-existent, the business case is seriously flawed.

2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, Lehman reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Adherence to DOE Order 413.3 Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets;
- Successful fabrication of facility components;
- Effectiveness in meeting construction schedule and budget; and
- Quality of key staff overseeing the project(s).

A to A+	Laboratory has identified and implemented practices that would allow the project scope to be increased if such were desirable, without impact on baseline cost or schedule; Laboratory always provides exemplary project status reports on time to DOE and takes the initiative to communicate emerging problems or issues. There is high confidence throughout the execution phase that the project will meet its cost/schedule performance baseline; Reviews identify environment, safety and health practices to be exemplary.
B+	The project meets CD-2 performance measures; the laboratory provides sustained leadership and commitment to environment, safety and health; reviews regularly recognize the laboratory for being proactive in the management of the execution phase of the project; to a large extent, problems are identified and corrected by the laboratory with little, or no impact on scope, cost or schedule; DOE is kept informed of project status on a regular basis; reviews regularly indicate project is expected to meet its cost/schedule performance baseline.
B	The project fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	Reviews indicate project remains at risk of breaching its cost/schedule performance baseline; Laboratory commitment to environment, safety and health issues is adequate; Reports to DOE can vary in degree of completeness; Laboratory commitment to the project appears to be subsiding.
D	Reviews indicate project is likely to breach its cost/schedule performance baseline; and/or Laboratory commitment to environment, safety and health issues is inadequate; reports to DOE are largely incomplete; laboratory commitment to the project has subsided.
F	Laboratory falsifies data during project execution phase; shows disdain for executing the project within minimal standards for environment, safety or health, fails to keep DOE informed of project status; reviews regularly indicate that the project is expected to breach its cost/schedule performance baseline.

2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, peer reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, performance against benchmarks, Approved Financial Plans (AFPs), etc.:

- Availability, reliability, and efficiency of facility(ies);
- Degree the facility is optimally arranged to support community;
- Whether R&D is conducted to develop/expand the capabilities of the facility(ies);
- Effectiveness in balancing resources between facility R&D and user support; and
- Quality of the process used to allocate facility time to users.

A to A+	Performance of the facility exceeds expectations as defined before the start of the year in any of these categories: cost of operations, users served, availability, beam delivery, or luminosity, and this performance can be directly attributed to the efforts of the laboratory; and /or: the schedule and the costs associated with the ramp-up to steady state operations are less than planned and are acknowledged to be 'leadership caliber' by reviews; Data on ES&H continues to be exemplary and widely regarded as among the 'best in class'.

B+	Performance of the facility meets expectations as defined before the start of the year in all of these categories: cost of operations, users served, availability, beam delivery, or luminosity, and this performance can be directly attributed to the efforts of the laboratory; and/or: the schedule and the costs associated with the ramp-up to steady state operations occur as planned; Data on ES&H continues to be very good as compared with other projects in the DOE.
B	The project fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	Performance of the facility fails to meet expectations in several of the areas listed under B+; for example, the cost of operations is unexpectedly high and availability of the facility is unexpectedly low, the number of users is unexpectedly low, beam delivery or luminosity is well below expectations. Facility operates at steady state, on cost and on schedule, but the reliability of performance is somewhat below planned values, **or** the facility operates at steady state, but the associated schedule and costs exceed planned values. Commitment to ES&H is satisfactory.
D	Performance of the facility fails to meet expectations in many of the areas listed under B+; for example, the cost of operations is unexpectedly high and availability of the facility is unexpectedly low. Facility operates somewhat below steady state, on cost and on schedule, and the reliability performance is somewhat below planned values, **or** the facility operates at steady state, but the schedule and costs associated exceed planned values. Commitment to ES&H is satisfactory.
F	The facility fails to operate; the facility operates well below steady state **and/or** the reliability of the performance is well below planned values.

2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Laboratory's Research Base and External User Community

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by peer reviews, participation in international design teams, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The facility is being used to perform influential science;
- Contractor's efforts to take full advantage of the facility to strengthen the Laboratory's research base;
- Conversely the facility is strengthened by a resident research community that pushes the envelope of what the facility can do and/or are among the scientific leaders of the community;
- Contractor's ability to appropriately balance access by internal and external user communities; and
- There is a healthy program of outreach to the scientific community.

A to A+	Reviews document that multiple disciplines are using the facility in new and novel ways, that the facility is being used to pursue influential science, that full advantage has been taken of the facility to enhance external user access, and strengthen the laboratory's research base. A healthy outreach program is in place.
B+	Reviews state strong and effective approach exists toward establishing a large external and internal user community; that the facility is being used for

	influential science; the laboratory is capitalizing on existence of facility to grow internal scientific capabilities. A healthy outreach program is in place.
B	Reviews state that lab is establishing an external and internal user community, but laboratory is still not capitalizing fully on existence of the facility to grow internal capabilities and/or reach out to external users.
C	Reviews state that the laboratory has made satisfactory use of the facility, but has not demonstrated much innovation.
D	Few facility users, with none using it in novel ways; research base is very thin.
F	Laboratory does not know how to operate/use its own facility adequately.

Science Program Office[1]	**Letter Grade**	**Numerical Score**	**Weight**	**Weighted Score**	**Overall Score**
Office of High Energy Physics					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			25%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			25%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			50%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community			0%		
				Overall HEP Total	

Table 2.1 – 2.0 Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

Science Program Office	**Letter Grade**	**Numerical Score**	**Funding Weight (BA)**	**Weighted Score**	**Overall Weighted Score**
Office of High Energy Physics			100%		
				Overall Program Office Total	

Table 2.2 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development[2]

Total Score	**4.3-4.1**	**4.0-3.8**	**3.7-3.5**	**3.4-3.1**	**3.0-2.8**	**2.7-2.5**	**2.4-2.1**	**2.0-1.8**	**1.7-1.1**	**1.0-0.8**	**0.7-0**
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 2.3 – 2.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

[1] A complete listing of S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

[2] Weightings for the Customer listed within Table 2.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

3.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management

The Contractor provides effective program vision and leadership; strategic planning and development of initiatives; recruits and retains a quality scientific workforce; and provides outstanding research processes, which improve research productivity.

The weight of this Goal is 25%.

The Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall management in executing S&T programs. Dimensions of program management covered include: 1) providing key competencies to support research programs to include key staffing requirements; 2) providing quality research plans that take into account technical risks, identify actions to mitigate risks; and 3) maintaining effective communications with customers to include providing quality responses to customer needs.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science Program Office as identified below. The overall Goal score from each Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 3.1). Weightings for each office listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

- Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) (0.1%)
- Office of High Energy Physics (HEP) (99.8%)
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) (0.1%)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 3.2 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 3.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. Individual Program Office weightings for each of the Objectives identified below are provided within Table 3.1. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science Program Offices for which the laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives, the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2009 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

Objectives:

3.1 Provide Effective and Efficient Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Program Vision

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by peer reviews, existence and quality of strategic plans as determined by SC and scientific community review, Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Efficiency and Effectiveness of joint planning (e.g., workshops) with outside community;
- Articulation of scientific vision;
- Development of core competencies, ideas for new facilities and research programs; and
- Ability to attract and retain highly qualified staff.

A to A+	Providing strong programmatic vision that extends past the laboratory and for which the lab is a recognized leader within SC and in the broader research communities; development and maintenance of outstanding core competencies, including achieving superior scientific excellence in both exploratory, high-risk research and research that is vital to the DOE/SC missions; attraction and retention of world-leading scientists; recognition within the community as a world leader in the field.
B+	Coherent programmatic vision within the laboratory with input from and output to external research communities; development and maintenance of strong core competencies that are cognizant of the need for both high-risk research and stewardship for mission-critical research; attracting and retaining scientific staff who are very talented in all programs.
B	Programmatic vision that is only partially coherent and not entirely well connected with external communities; development and maintenance of some, but not all core competencies with attention to, but not always the correct balance between, high-risk and mission-critical research; attraction and retention of scientific staff who are talented in most programs.
C	Failure to achieve a coherent programmatic vision with little or no connection with external communities; partial development and maintenance of core competencies (i.e., some are neglected) with imbalance between high-risk and mission-critical research; attracting only mediocre scientists while losing the most talented ones.
D	Minimal attempt to achieve programmatic vision; little ability to develop any core competencies with a complete lack of high-risk research and ignorance of mission-critical areas; minimal success in attracting even reasonably talented scientists.
F	No attempt made to achieve programmatic vision; no demonstrated ability to develop any core competencies with a complete lack of high-risk research and ignorance of mission-critical areas; failure to attract even reasonably talented scientists.

3.2 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Project/Program Planning and Management

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by peer reviews, existence and quality of strategic plans as determined by SC and scientific community review, Program Office and scientific community review/oversight, etc.:

- Quality of R&D and/or user facility strategic plans;
- Adequacy in considering technical risks;
- Success in identifying/avoiding technical problems;
- Effectiveness in leveraging (synergy with) other areas of research; and
- Demonstration of willingness to make tough decisions (i.e., cut programs with sub-critical mass of expertise, divert resources to more promising areas, etc.).

A to A+	Research plans are proactive, not reactive, as evidenced by making hard decisions and taking strong actions; plans are robust against budget fluctuations – multiple contingencies planned for; new initiatives are proposed and funded through reallocation of resources from less effective programs; plans are updated regularly to reflect changing scientific and fiscal conditions; plans include ways to reduce risk, duration of programs.
B+	Plans are reviewed by experts outside of lab management and/or include broadly-based input from within the laboratory; research plans exist for all program areas; plans are consistent with known budgets and well-aligned with DOE interests; work follows the plan.
B	Research plans exist for all program areas; work follows the plan.
C	Research plans exist for most program areas; work does not always follow the plan.
D	Plans do not exist for a significant fraction of the lab's program areas, or significant work is conducted outside those plans.
F	No planning is done.

3.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Communications and Responsiveness to Customer Needs

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The quality, accuracy and timeliness of response to customer requests for information;
- The extent to which the Contractor keeps the customer informed of both positive and negative events at the Laboratory so that the customer can deal effectively with both internal and external constituencies; and
- The ease of determining the appropriate contact (who is on-point for what).

A to A+	Communication channels are well-defined and information is effectively conveyed; important or critical information is delivered in real-time; responses to HQ requests for information from laboratory representatives are prompt, thorough, correct and succinct; laboratory representatives *always* initiate a communication with HQ on emerging issues so there are no surprises.
B+	Good communication is valued by all staff throughout the contractor organization; responses to requests for information are thorough and are provided in a timely manner; the integrity of the information provided is never in doubt.
B	Evidence of good communications is noted throughout the contractor organization and responses to requests for information provide the minimum requirements to meet HQ needs; with the exception of a few minor instances HQ is alerted to emerging issues.
C	Laboratory representatives recognize the value of sound communication with HQ to the mission of the laboratory. However, laboratory management fails to demonstrate that its employees are held accountable for ensuring effective communication and responsiveness; laboratory representatives do not take the initiative to alert HQ to emerging issues.
D	Communications from the laboratory are well-intentioned but generally incompetent; the laboratory management does not understand the importance of effective communication and responsiveness to the mission of the laboratory.
F	Contractor representatives are openly hostile and/or non-responsive – emails and phone calls are consistently ignored; communications typically do not address the request; information provided can be incorrect, inaccurate or fraudulent – information is not organized, is incomplete, or is fabricated.

Science Program Office[1]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Computing Scientific Research					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			30%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
				Overall ASCR Total	
Office of High Energy Physics					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			20%		
				Overall HEP Total	
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			40%		
				Overall WDTS Total	

Table 3.1 – 3.0 Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research			0.1%		
Office of High Energy Physics			99.8%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			0.1%		
				Overall Program Office Total	

Table 3.2 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development[2]

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 3.3 – 3.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

[1] A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

[2] Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 1.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

Each Objective within Goals 4 through 8 are to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the evaluating office as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used, the outcomes of measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting an Objective.

Each overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective and summing them. The Performance Rating Development table located at the conclusion of each Goal section is used for this purpose. The overall Goal score earned is then compared to each Goal's Final Letter Grade table to determine the appropriate letter grade.

4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory

The Contractor's Leadership provides effective and efficient direction in strategic planning to meet the mission and vision of the overall Laboratory; is accountable and responsive to specific issues and needs when required; and corporate office leadership provides appropriate levels of resources and support for the overall success of the Laboratory.

The weight of this Goal is 25%.

The Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory Goal shall measure the Contractor's Leadership capabilities in leading the direction of the overall Laboratory. It also measures the responsiveness of the Contractor to issues and opportunities for continuous improvement and corporate office involvement/commitment to the overall success of the Laboratory.

Objectives:

4.1 Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Quality of the Vision developed for the Laboratory and effectiveness in identifying its distinctive characteristics;
- Quality of Strategic/Work Plan for achieving the approved Laboratory vision;
- Quality of required Laboratory Business Plan;
- Ability to establish and maintain long-term partnerships/relationships that advance/expand ongoing Laboratory missions and/or provide new opportunities/capabilities; and

- Effectiveness in developing and implementing commercial research and development opportunities that leverage accomplishment of DOE goals and projects with other federal agencies that advances the utilization of Laboratory technologies and capabilities.

The weight of this Objective is 35%.

Measure 4.1.1
Effective development and implementation of Laboratory Vision and Business Plans (both strategic and annual).

Target 4.1.1.1
Laboratory Vision and Business Plans (strategic and annual) are clearly aligned with the DOE missions and meet all established DOE requirements, including quality of documents, clarity, conciseness, and overall usefulness. Laboratory implementation aligns with the vision and plans.

Measure 4.1.2
Establish strategic partnerships and communications that effectively support the Laboratory vision, plans, and mission accomplishment.

Target 4.1.2.1
Strategic partnerships are established that support the Laboratory's scientific leadership, the leveraging of DOE resources, and support collaborative programs with key government, industry, laboratory, and university entities. The Laboratory establishes and fosters effective external communication that builds support for mission accomplishment, such as maintaining appropriate relations with the community to include providing for open and honest communications and establishing and maintaining long-term partnerships/relationships that advance the Laboratory Vision and Strategic Business Plan and help to shape the High Energy Physics community support.

4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Leadership's ability to instill responsibility and accountability down and through the entire organization; and
- The effectiveness and efficiency of Leadership in identifying and/or responding to Laboratory issues or opportunities for continuous improvement.

The weight of this Objective is 35%.

Measure 4.2.1
Leadership proactively identifies and addresses opportunities for improvement.

Target 4.2.1.1
DOE evaluation, with input from reviews; operational awareness activities; and self-assessments completed within the performance period, indicates that Leadership proactively and effectively identifies and addresses opportunities for improvement.

Measure 4.2.2
Leadership's response to Laboratory issues and review team recommendations is timely, and immediate mitigating actions were identified and implemented as appropriate. Leadership maintains cognizance of corrective action plans, ensuring timely and effective implementation of corrections.

Target 4.2.2.1
DOE evaluation of issues that arise within the performance period, with input from reviews and operational awareness activities, indicates that Leadership responses are appropriate, effective, and timely.

Measure 4.2.3
Identify all major Laboratory costs in elements including (but not limited to) labor, labor overhead, operating, capital and construction. The structure and associated baseline Cost of Doing Business (CODB) reports shall be detailed to further a common understanding of how obligations under the M&O contract are costed.

Target 4.2.3.1
An FY 2009 CODB report is required for each of the quarters ending December 31, March 31, June 30, and September 30. Reports are to be submitted to FSO within 30 days after the close of the reporting period.

Measure 4.2.4
The Laboratory will pursue opportunities to reduce the cost of doing business in areas such as operational efficiency, program execution, business strategies, and labor and benefits through the development of a Cost Savings Study.

Target 4.2.4.1
Develop an FY 2009 CODB Cost Savings Study that identifies major cost categories, cost drivers, and cost elements (fixed and variable) and potential cost savings within each category. The Cost Savings Study shall consider current and future expenses and funding. The FY 2009 CODB Cost Savings Study is to be delivered to FSO by April 30, 2009.

4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Corporate Office involvement in and support of business and other infrastructure process and procedure improvements;
- The willingness to enter into and effectiveness of joint appointments when appropriate; and;

- Where appropriate, the willingness to develop and work with the Department in implementing innovative financing agreements and/or provide private investments into the Laboratory.

The weight of this Objective is 30%.

Measure 4.3.1
Corporate Leadership directs independent peer reviews of Laboratory management systems and processes that result in an effective overall assessment of key Laboratory administrative and operations support functions and management systems.

Target 4.3.1.1
An independent peer review of Laboratory management systems and processes is conducted annually. Reviews identify strengths/weaknesses, areas of significant risks, and opportunities for improvement. The number of significant issues raised in other non-corporate reviews should be minimal.

Measure 4.3.2
Corporate Leadership provides timely and effective policy guidance and oversight, facilitates corporate reach back and provides vital resources to effectively address emerging issues and implement appropriate follow-on actions, and facilitates a process of continuing improvement.

Target 4.3.2.1
DOE evaluation, with input from reviews and operational awareness activities done within the performance period, indicates that important issues are resolved appropriately. Effective Corporate Leadership in resolving important issues and Departmental concerns.

Measure 4.3.3
Corporate Leadership maintains cognizance of significant commitments made and assures their timely accomplishment and acts as an effective advocate for the Laboratory.

Target 4.3.3.1
Corporate Leadership ensures that commitments made in the contractor's proposal, and significant corporate commitments made to DOE during the current performance period are successfully accomplished as planned and acts as an effective advocate for the Laboratory.

	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
4.0 Effectiveness and Efficiency of Contractor Leadership and Stewardship					
4.1 Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans			35%		
4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization			35%		
4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate			30%		
Performance Goal 4.0 Total					

Table 4.1 – 4.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

Total Score	**4.3-4.1**	**4.0-3.8**	**3.7-3.5**	**3.4-3.1**	**3.0-2.8**	**2.7-2.5**	**2.4-2.1**	**2.0-1.8**	**1.7-1.1**	**1.0-0.8**	**0.7-0**
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 4.2 – 4.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection

The Contractor sustains and enhances the effectiveness of integrated safety, health and environmental protection through a strong and well deployed system.

The weight of this Goal is 25%.

The Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall success in preventing worker injury and illness; implement ISM down through and across the organization; and provide effective and efficient waste management, minimization, and pollution prevention.

Objectives:

5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The success in meeting ES&H goals.

The weight of this Objective is 35%.

Measure 5.1.1
Combined Days Away, Restricted, Transferred (DART) for Laboratory employees and subcontractor workers for the performance period (October 1, 2008 – September 30, 2009).

Target 5.1.1.1
DART rate = 0.25

Measure 5.1.2
Combined Total Recordable Case Rate (TRCR) for Laboratory employees and subcontractor workers for the performance period (October 1, 2008 – September 30, 2009).

Target 5.1.2.1
TRC rate = 0.65

Measure 5.1.3
Reporting of non-compliances with 10 CFR 835, 10 CFR 850 and 10 CFR 851 into the ORPS and/or NTS tracking systems is done in a timely manner including corrective action follow-up and closure tracking.

Target 5.1.3.1
95% of non-compliances that meet the established DOE threshold of 10 CFR 835, 850, 851 are reported within NTS within 20 days of recognition.

Target 5.1.3.2
90% of the corrective actions that result from each non-compliance scheduled for completion during the performance period are completed as scheduled.

Measure 5.1.4
Innovations or improvements that can credibly improve the control of future radiation exposures are documented. One point will be credited for each identification. An additional point will be awarded for implementation of the identified improvement.

Target 5.1.4.1
8 Points

Measure 5.1.5
All work involving significant potential for radiation exposure to the workforce is subjected to an ALARA Radiological Work Permit review.

Target 5.1.5.1
100% of all jobs for which the projected collective Total Effective Dose Equivalent (TEDE) exceeds 200 person-mrem are reviewed both pre-job and post-job in accordance with the existing ALARA Program.

Measure 5.1.6
All energized electrical work on AC power distribution systems over 50 volts is to be performed under a rigorous review process requiring approval by the Chief Operating Officer.

Target 5.1.6.1
100% of all energized electrical work on power distribution systems over 50 volts is reviewed by the Chief Operating Officer.

Measure 5.1.7
Analyze OSHA-recordable injuries for human performance issues.

Target 5.1.7.1
95% of all OSHA recordable injuries that occur on site to Laboratory employees, subcontractors, and users have a formal causal analysis performed which incorporates Human Performance Improvement tenets, within 30 days of a recordable incident determination.

Measure 5.1.8
Perform a series of division/section assessments on the implementation of the 10 CFR 851 Standard for Laboratory and subcontractor staff.

Target 5.1.8.1
Follow FY09 schedule for implementation of assessments to be performed during the review period: 10 CFR 851.20 – Management Responsibilities and Worker Rights and Responsibilities; 10 CFR 851.21 – Hazard Identification and Assessment; 10 CFR 851.22 – Hazard Prevention and Abatement, and 10 CFR 851 Appendix A – Industrial Hygiene.

Measure 5.1.9
Enhance the oversight of corrective actions and closure of items resulting from formal Fermi Site Office ES&H oversight reviews.

Target 5.1.9.1
95% of corrective actions resulting from documented FSO assessment reports, and scheduled for completion during the performance period, are completed on time.

Measure 5.1.10
Enhance the effectiveness of the Laboratory Contractor Assurance System (CAS).

Target 5.1.10.1
Fully implement improvements to the CAS that were identified in the February 27, 2008, FSO CAS report. This includes completing any actions remaining from FY 2008 and those scheduled for completion during this performance period.

5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environment Management

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The commitment of leadership to strong ES&H performance is appropriately demonstrated;
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of hazard identification, prevention, and control processes/activities; and
- The degree to which scientists and workers are involved and engaged in the ES&H program at the bench level.

The weight of this Objective is 35%.

Measure 5.2.1
Safety-related training for line managers and staff is well-developed, and required training is identified in Individual Training Needs Assessments (ITNAs) for all managers and staff.

Target 5.2.1.1
Completion of ITNAs for all employees is ensured and is tracked.

Target 5.2.1.2
Completion of required ES&H training for all employees is tracked and status is discussed at senior managers meetings.

Target 5.2.1.3
Safety training is periodically reviewed and updated to ensure it is current and effective in meeting Laboratory employees' needs.

Measure 5.2.2
Staff demonstrates cognizance and engagement in the safety program through participation in the Laboratory Safety Committee (LSC) and its various Subcommittees. The LSC meets on a monthly basis to discuss issues of ES&H import. Activity reports from the Subcommittees are provided at these meetings to inform and engage the committee members. Minutes are also posted on the ES&H website for all to view.

Target 5.2.2.1
90% of the scheduled LSC meetings are held and the minutes are posted within 10 working days of the meeting.

Measure 5.2.3
An open reporting culture is maintained at the Laboratory while appropriately responding to ESH&Q incidents. FSO and the Laboratory will meet on a monthly basis to optimize communication between the two organizations on ESH&Q topics. Agenda items will include:

- New DOE initiatives and status of action items associated with them;
- Current DOE-SC action items and requests;
- Recent non-routine events;
- Lessons Learned from various sources; and
- Opportunities for program improvements.

Target 5.2.3.1
90% of the meetings are conducted, with the end result that communication on key ES&H issues is enhanced.

Measure 5.2.4
Laboratory senior management clearly demonstrates their commitment to strong safety performance.

Target 5.2.4.1
The Laboratory Director conducts twelve routine management walkthroughs and/or meetings with division/section staff to discuss the importance of work planning to prevent accidents and injuries.

Target 5.2.4.2
Article of communication by senior laboratory management on an environment, safety, or health topic in *Fermilab Today* or a division newsletter on a monthly basis.

Measure 5.2.5
Laboratory divisions and sections maintain their organizational ES&H Plans as a grass-roots foundation to the Laboratory ES&H program.

Target 5.2.5.1
All divisions/sections will have updated their organizational ES&H Plans by the end of the review period.

Measure 5.2.6
The Laboratory will continue to strongly support the Highly Protected Risk (HPR) Inspection Program as a foundation of the Laboratory safety program.

Target 5.2.6.1
90% of the HPR inspections will be performed on schedule.

Measure 5.2.7
Develop a Laboratory policy for the implementation of the applicable requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Target 5.2.7.1
By September 30, 2009, develop a written plan for NEPA policy implementation, which includes:

- Assignment of responsibilities for NEPA implementation as appropriate, including a principal Laboratory point of contact responsible for coordinating NEPA requirements; and
- An approach to ensure timely NEPA planning, initiation, coordination and conclusion. This approach will demonstrate consideration of lessons learned from preparing the NOvA Project Environmental Assessment.

5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- ISO 14001 certification; and
- Efficiency and Effectiveness of efforts to minimize the generation of waste.

The weight of this Objective is 30%.

Measure 5.3.1
Success in minimizing waste generation from major Laboratory programmatic and support activities.

Target 5.3.1.1
95% of proposed work will incorporate an environmental review through evaluation processes associated with Safety Assessment Documents, National Environmental Policy Act reviews, and Construction Reviews to identify opportunities to reduce hazardous and radioactive waste generation, maximize recycling and reuse, and to mitigate potential adverse environmental effects.

Measure 5.3.2
Successful User involvement in environmental planning, minimizing waste generation and avoiding adverse environmental effects from experimental activities.

Target 5.3.2.1
During the performance period, 95% of proposed experimental work involving the Laboratory User community will utilize environmental reviews through implementation of the Particle Physics Division's Operational Readiness Clearance process to identify opportunities to reduce hazardous and radioactive waste generation, to maximize recycling and reuse, to maximize opportunities to purchase products containing recycled materials, and to reduce the potential to create adverse environmental effects.

Measure 5.3.3
Successful lab-wide implementation of an Environmental Management System as demonstrated by performing opportunity assessments that evaluate the potential to improve specific environmental aspects.

Target 5.3.3.1
During the performance period, the Contractor develops a plan and schedule to evaluate opportunities to improve specific environmental aspects laboratory-wide, engage participation from each Division and Section in planned assessments and to document the assessments' results.

Measure 5.3.4
The Laboratory remains open to continual improvements in its safety and environmental programs, including the potential benefits of obtaining certification in international standards.

Target 5.3.4.1
Maintain the certificates of registration in ISO 14001 and OHSAS 18001 throughout this performance period.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection					
5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment			35%		
5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environment Management			35%		
5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention			30%		
Performance Goal 5.0 Total					

Table 5.1 – 5.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 5.2 – 5.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)

The Contractor sustains and enhances core business systems that provide efficient and effective support to Laboratory programs and its mission(s).

The weight of this Goal is 25%.

The Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s) Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall success in deploying, implementing, and improving integrated business system that efficiently and effectively support the mission(s) of the Laboratory.

Objectives:

6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)

In measuring the performance of this Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Demonstration of efficient and effective financial management system(s) support;
- The effectiveness of the financial management system(s) as validated by internal and external audits and reviews;
- The continual improvement of financial management system(s) through the use of results of audits, review, and other information; and
- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by Contractor management and staff.

The weight of this Objective is 19%.

Measure 6.1.1
Effective cash and debt management practices. (Vendors are paid on time.)

Target 6.1.1.1
97% of all vendors will be paid on time.

Target 6.1.1.2
100% of major vendors will be paid on time. (A major vendor is defined as a vendor that provides services in excess of $5,000,000 or more in a fiscal year or a vendor whose performance is so intricately tied to Laboratory performance that any interruption in service would impair Laboratory Performance.)

Notes and Assumptions:

1. Vendor invoices subject to measurement include: Contracts, Agreements and Purchase Orders entered into the Laboratory's Purchasing Module of Oracle Public Sector Financials.

2. Definition of "paid on time" is per the terms of individual purchase orders.

Measure 6.1.2
Effective Budget Management (Budget Formulation).

Target 6.1.2.1
The Laboratory's budget submission complies with all DOE guidance and is submitted in a timely fashion. The DOE annual budget validation reports no significant findings.

Measure 6.1.3
Effective Budget Management (Budget Execution).

The measure will address the execution of the fiscal year budget for programs funded through the Department. This includes ensuring costs and commitments are properly reported and within DOE-authorized funding levels, and proper management of uncosted balances. Costs and commitments of all programs, including cost of work for others and work for others including reimbursables are managed properly. Issues arising from budget execution activities may require corrective actions by the laboratory and also by DOE-CH.

Target 6.1.3.1
Costs are reported at the proper detail: Budget and Reporting Classification account, Work Order, or Project Baseline Summary (PBS) level, as applicable.

Target 6.1.3.2
Costs do not exceed total budget authority provided in the contract. It is FSO's expectation that the Laboratory's budget execution fully addresses proper reporting of costs, proper management of uncosted balances and convincingly demonstrates those expectations and demonstrates no weaknesses.

Measure 6.1.4
Number of material findings resulting from financial audits, reviews, and other assessments or appraisals which highlight weakness in the Laboratory business and management control structure.

(Note: A material finding is a failure or shortcoming which produces an error or misstatement that is sufficiently large as to influence a financial statement reader's judgment of a given situation.)

Target 6.1.4.1
No material findings.

6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition Management System(s)

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Demonstration of efficient and effective acquisition management system(s) support;
- The effectiveness of the acquisition management system(s) as validated by internal and external audits and reviews;
- The continual improvement of acquisition management system(s); through the use of results of audits, review, and other information; and

- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by Contractor management and staff.

The weight of this Objective is 19%.

Measure 6.2.1
Evaluation of the Procurement function in accordance with the DOE approved Procurement Balanced Scorecard.

As the requirements contained within the DOE Contractor Procurement Balanced Scorecard effectively highlight the performance objective listed above, performance will be evaluated based on results of the FY 2009 Procurement Balanced Scorecard. The DOE Contractor Procurement Balanced Scorecard is a functional component of the departmental business systems performance measurement and management program issued by the DOE Procurement Executive. Contractors are expected to achieve the most effective combination of performance results in accordance with Departmental expectations, customer requirements, laws, regulations, good business management practices, and the terms and conditions of their contracts.

Target 6.2.1.1
Comprehensive score of 90 out of 100.

Measure 6.2.2
The Laboratory successfully meets Acquisition Management M&O contract requirements**.**

Target 6.2.2.1
The Laboratory will timely submit required documents for Site Office review and/or approval which are complete, of a high quality and contain no critical issues.

Measure 6.2.3
The Laboratory demonstrates a commitment to process improvements in the Acquisition Management System.

Target 6.2.3.1
The Laboratory will identify at least two procurement areas for process improvements by March 31, 2009, will obtain DOE concurrence prior to implementation, and will complete their implementation prior to September 30, 2009.

6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Property Management System(s)

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Demonstration of efficient and effective property management system(s) support;
- The effectiveness of the property management system(s) as validated by internal and external audits and reviews;
- The continual improvement of property management system(s); through the use of results of audits, review, and other information; and
- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by Contractor management and staff.

The weight of this Objective is 19%.

Measure 6.3.1
Evaluation of the Property function in accordance with the DOE-approved Procurement Balanced Scorecard.

As the requirements contained within the DOE Contractor Personal Property Balanced Scorecard effectively highlight the performance objective listed above, performance will be evaluated based on results of the FY 2009 Property Management Balanced Scorecard. The DOE Contractor Personal Property Management Balanced Scorecard is a functional component of the departmental business systems performance measurement and management program issued by the DOE Procurement Executive. Contractors are expected to achieve the most effective combination of performance results in accordance with Departmental expectations, customer requirements, laws, regulations, good business management practices, and the terms and conditions of their contracts.

Target 6.3.1.1
Comprehensive score of 90 out of 100.

Measure 6.3.2
The Laboratory will provide effective management and oversight of the Fleet Management function.

Target 6.3.2.1
The Laboratory satisfactorily and timely resolves concerns/issues identified as a result of DOE's oversight and/or internal self-assessment.

Target 6.3.2.2
All Vehicle Management reporting procedures are effectively implemented and data submitted to DOE is accurate, complete and timely.

6.4 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System and Diversity Program

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Demonstration of efficient and effective human resources management system support;
- The effectiveness of the human resources management system as validated by internal and external audits and reviews;
- The continual improvement of the human resources management system through the use of results of audits, review, and other information; and
- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by Contractor management and staff.

The weight of this Objective is 19%.

Measure 6.4.1
Development of a succession plan to ensure continuous quality leadership at the Laboratory.

Target 6.4.1.1
Analysis and determination of succession plan best practices through research of a minimum of six national laboratories or comparable businesses plans and the determination of Laboratory specific planning needs through discussions with no fewer than 75% of Laboratory Associate Directors; and, by September 30, 2009, submittal of a draft Laboratory Succession Plan incorporating the results of these analyses to the Laboratory Directorate for approval.

Measure 6.4.2
The Laboratory will increase the effectiveness of recruiting and performance reviews to improve productivity through the use of Roles, Responsibilities, Authorities and Accountabilities (R2A2) documentation.

Target 6.4.2.1
The Laboratory will successfully develop an R2A2 format, and prepare a minimum of 15% of the number of R2A2 documents determined to be applicable after the completion of an internal analysis of Laboratory positions.

Measure 6.4.3
The Laboratory will incorporate scientific hiring procedures into Human Resource employment processes.

Target 6.4.4.1
The Laboratory will successfully complete appropriate scientific hiring procedures incorporation into the Laboratory hiring processes, train a minimum of 75% of scientific managers who regularly hire scientists in those procedures and use the procedures for a minimum of 60% of all new scientific hires.

Measure 6.4.4
The Laboratory will staff the Director's Diversity Council which will work to strengthen the diversity of Laboratory personnel and improve the retention of diversity candidates.

Target 6.4.4.1
The Laboratory will successfully complete the staffing of seven Diversity Council committees, which combined will include at least 2% of the entire Laboratory employee population, and which will reflect the overall diversity of the Laboratory's staff.

Measure 6.4.5
The major Diversity Council committees will make viable and beneficial recommendations to improve the Laboratory's ability to attract and retain top quality employees.

Target 6.4.5.1
The Laboratory will successfully implement a minimum of two Diversity Council committee recommendations.

6.5 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Demonstration of efficient and effective management systems support;
- The effectiveness of the management systems as validated by internal and external audits and reviews;
- The continual improvement of management systems through the use of results of audits, review, and other information; and
- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by Contractor management and staff.

The weight of this Objective is 19%.

Measure 6.5.1
Internal Audits are conducted in accordance with applicable auditing standards.

Target 6.5.1.1
Demonstrate effective Internal Audit and Oversight (IA) as assessed through external reviews, surveys and inspections of IA.

Measure 6.5.2
Contractor's success in meeting Internal Audit and Oversight management goals and expectations.

Target 6.5.2.1
Approved Internal Audit Plan and substitutions are accomplished and open Internal Audit findings are effectively tracked and resolved in a timely manner.

Measure 6.5.3
By the end of this performance period, demonstrate implementation of an approved Fermilab Integrated Quality Assurance Program (IQAP) and effective compliance with DOE Order 414.1C, Quality Assurance.

Target 6.5.3.1
Complete the lab-wide "As-Is" quality assurance baseline activity (gap analysis) and the resultant Corrective Action Plan on an approved schedule.

Target 6.5.3.2
Appoint, train, and activate Quality Assurance Representatives to support the implementation of the Quality Assurance Program and work toward full compliance with DOE Order 414.1C under the approved IQAP and graded approach.

Measure 6.5.4
The Laboratory's success in meeting business system Information Technology management goals and expectations.

Target 6.5.4.1
Business System Information Technology (IT) projects in excess of $500,000 achieve 90% of the schedule, budget and technical milestones specified in the Approved Project Plan.

Measure 6.5.5
The Laboratory provides effective tactical business system IT planning in support of the Laboratory's missions and goals.

Target 6.5.5.1
FY 2010 business system Information Management (IM) plans are in alignment with the Laboratory's Strategic Plan and are in place by September 30, 2009.

Measure 6.5.6
The business system IM products and services meet customer requirements.

Target 6.5.6.1
The business system IM products and services meet customer requirements as demonstrated by 88% positive customer feedback.

Measure 6.5.7
The business system IM Program provides cost effective products and improved services.

Target 6.5.7.1
The business system IM projects are completed as identified in the IM plans and demonstrate measurable improvement and cost effective services and products.

Measure 6.5.8
The Laboratory effectively prepares for and successfully follows a DOE Earned Value Management System Certification process in coordination with and subject to support from the DOE Office of Engineering & Construction Management, Program/PSO and Site Office. This measure supports meeting the objective to employ an EVMS that is compliant with ANSI/EIA-748-A-1998 per DOE Order 413.3A requirements.

Target 6.5.8.1
The Laboratory completes the EVMS Readiness Assessment, On-Site Review, and Corrective Action steps, working to achieve certification by September 30, 2009.

6.6 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The proper stewardship of intellectual assets and Laboratory owned or originated technology;
- The market impacts created/generated as a result of technology transfer and deployment activities; and
- Communication products contributing to the transfer of Laboratory originated knowledge and technology.

The weight of this Objective is 5%.

Measure 6.6.1
The Laboratory will timely report new inventions to DOE, filing U.S. and where appropriate, foreign patent applications to create intellectual property assets.

Target 6.6.1.1
All intellectual assets deployed through license agreements, option agreements or technology assistance agreements resulting in royalty income or license income is used according to the DOE approved Royalty Plan and funds are accounted for and audited in accordance with requirements.

Target 6.6.1.2
The Laboratory takes a proactive approach to public outreach through such activities as maintaining current information on its Web pages, conducting presentations, issuing press releases and newsletters and distributing up-to-date pamphlets."

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)					
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)			19%		
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition Management System(s)			19%		
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Property Management System(s)			19%		
6.4 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System and Diversity Program			19%		
6.5 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate.			19%		
6.6 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets			5%		
				Performance Goal 6.0 Total	

Table 6.1-6.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

Total Score	**4.3-4.1**	**4.0-3.8**	**3.7-3.5**	**3.4-3.1**	**3.0-2.8**	**2.7-2.5**	**2.4-2.1**	**2.0-1.8**	**1.7-1.1**	**1.0-0.8**	**0.7-0**
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 6.2 – 6.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs.

The Contractor provides appropriate planning for, construction and management of Laboratory facilities and infrastructures required to efficiently and effectively carry out current and future S&T programs.

The weight of this Goal is 15%.

The Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs Goal shall measure the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in planning for, delivering, and operations of Laboratory facilities and equipment needed to ensure required capabilities are present to meet today's and tomorrow's complex challenges.

Objectives:

7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage and Minimizes Life Cycle Costs and Ensures Site Capability to Meet Mission Needs.

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The management of real property assets to maintain effective operational safety, worker health, environmental protection and compliance, property preservation, and cost effectiveness while meeting program missions, through effective facility utilization, maintenance and budget execution;
- The day-to-day management and utilization of space in the active portfolio;
- The maintenance and renewal of building systems, structures and components associated with the Laboratory's facility and land assets; and
- The management of energy use and conservation practices.

The weight of this Objective is 60%.

Measure 7.1.1
Effectiveness and Efficiency of maintenance activities to maximize the operational life of facility systems, structures, and components: (Scheduled hours vs. total hours, measured as a percentage).

Target 7.1.1.1
>80%

Measure 7.1.2
Demonstrated efficiency and effectiveness for recapitalization and acquisition of required facilities and infrastructure to support the mission readiness of Laboratory programs and performance of maintenance.

Target 7.1.2.1
Documentation is provided that validates the readiness of existing facilities and infrastructure to carryout the assigned scientific missions as evidenced by: peer review; critical maintenance funding properly allocated and effectively spent, and summary tables within the mission readiness report which show improvement in existing facilities and/or infrastructure (e.g. have moved upward on the scale from "not capable" through "marginal" and "partial" to "capable").

Measure 7.1.3
For the performance period, the percentage of milestones completed (number of milestones completed/number of milestones planned), as documented in Construction Directives for General Plant Projects, In-House Energy Management and Accelerator Improvement Projects (AIP).

Target 7.1.3.1
> 90%

Measure 7.1.4
In support of the goals of the Department of Energy's Transformational Energy Action Management (TEAM) initiative, and the goals and objectives contained in Executive Order 13423, Strengthening Federal Environmental, Energy, and Transportation Management; the Contractor shall cooperate with FSO personnel to provide full and open access to the maximum extent practicable to NNSA/DOE-contracted Energy Service Companies (ESCOs) under Energy Savings Performance Contracts (ESPC), to facilitate on-site assessments of opportunities to improve the Site's energy efficiency, including water reduction and renewable energy improvements, and shall provide advisory assistance in reviewing ESCO recommendations as directed by the Contracting Officer. The Contractor shall ensure ESCO personnel are granted access pursuant to contractual requirements; monitor ESCO activities to ensure that site safety and security requirements are adhered to; promptly provide information requested by ESCO personnel to assist them in developing viable recommendations; and, when directed by the Contracting Officer, assist the Site Office in the monitoring and execution of ESPC projects.

Target 7.1.4.1
An acceptable finalization of the FY08 Executable Plan, which adequately addresses the site's contribution to meeting the Agency- wide goals of the TEAM initiative and Executive Order 13423, is developed after a period of consultation with DOE and is submitted to DOE for approval no later than December 31, 2008. In addition, 90% the actions identified in the finalized plan for completion in FY09 are accomplished on schedule.

7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to Support the Continuation and Growth of Laboratory Missions and Programs.

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Integration and alignment of the Laboratory's facilities and infrastructure planning documents to the Laboratory's comprehensive strategic plan;

- The facility planning, forecasting, and acquisition for effective translation of business needs into comprehensive and integrated facility site plans;
- The effectiveness in producing quality site and facility planning documents as required;
- The involvement of relevant stakeholders in all appropriate aspects of facility planning and preparation of required documentation;
- Overall responsiveness to customer mission needs; and
- Efficiency in meeting Cost and Schedule Performance Index for construction projects (when appropriate).

The weight of this Objective is 40%.

Measure 7.2.1
Percent of new GPP projects that were identified in the Laboratory's facilities and infrastructure planning documents at least one year before the authorization was approved. This shall exclude programmatic projects that have arisen out of rapidly changing program requirements as described by the laboratory and agreed to for exclusion by the Fermi Site Office.

Target 7.2.1.1
$\geq$ 80%

Measure 7.2.2
Amount of Scheduled Tevatron run time lost due to a failure of the electrical distribution system that is under the control of the Laboratory Infrastructure Management Group. Failure of the electrical distribution system will immediately shut down the Tevatron. Therefore, maintaining this system is critical.

Target 7.2.2.1
$\leq$ 5%

Measure 7.2.3
Amount of scheduled Tevatron run time lost due to a failure of the industrial water cooling system that is under the control of the Laboratory Infrastructure Management Group. Failure of the industrial water cooling system will shut down the Tevatron within a very short period of time. The Tevatron can not run without cooling. Therefore, maintaining this system is critical.

Target 7.2.3.1
$\leq$ 5%

Measure 7.2.4
The Laboratory's Internet bandwidth is maintained or adjusted to accommodate strategic research collaborations requiring extensive computation resources and transfer of large data sets.

Target 7.2.4.1
Internet Bandwidth is either maintained or adjusted to meet the Laboratory's mission.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs					
7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage and Minimizes Life Cycle Costs and Ensures Site Capability to Meet Mission Needs			60%		
7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to Support the Continuation and Growth of Laboratory Missions and Programs			40%		
Performance Goal 7.0 Total					

Table 7.1 – 7.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

Total Score	**4.3-4.1**	**4.0-3.8**	**3.7-3.5**	**3.4-3.1**	**3.0-2.8**	**2.7-2.5**	**2.4-2.1**	**2.0-1.8**	**1.7-1.1**	**1.0-0.8**	**0.7-0**
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 7.2 – 7.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems.

The Contractor sustains and enhances the effectiveness of integrated safeguards and security and emergency management through a strong and well deployed system.

The weight of this Goal is 10%.

The Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall success in safeguarding and securing Laboratory assets that supports the mission(s) of the Laboratory in an efficient and effective manner and provides an effective emergency management program.

Objectives:

8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The Contractor's success in meeting Emergency Management goals and expectations;
- The commitment of leadership to a strong Emergency Management performance is appropriately demonstrated; and
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of Emergency Management procedures and processes are effectively demonstrated.

The weight of this Objective is 40%.

Measure 8.1.1
Complete corrective actions for reviews in accordance with approved Corrective Action Plans.

Target 8.1.1.1
90% of emergency management findings from approved Tripartite reports and/or drill critiques scheduled for completion during the performance period are completed as scheduled.

Measure 8.1.2
Employee and Management awareness of their Emergency Management responsibilities.

Target 8.1.2.1
Annually conduct at least one EOC exercise.

Target 8.1.2.2
Annually conduct at least two facility drills per occupied building (tornado and fire evacuation).

Target 8.1.2.3:
All occupied buildings have the Local Area Emergency Plans (LAEPs) posted and those are maintained, up-to-date and meet all requirements for LAEPs.

8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The Contractor's success in meeting Cyber-Security goals and expectations;
- The commitment of leadership to a strong Cyber-Security performance is appropriately demonstrated;
- Integration of Cyber-Security into the culture of the organization for effective deployment of the system is demonstrated; and
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of Cyber-Security risk identification, prevention, and control processes/activities.

The weight of this Objective is 40%.

Measure 8.2.1
Amount of time that the Tevatron does not run, CDF/D0 experiments cannot take data, or business systems are unable to operate that is attributable to a successful cyber attack.

Target 8.2.1.1
< 20 hours

Measure 8.2.2
Amount of experiment data that is irrecoverably lost attributable to a successful cyber attack.

Target 8.2.2.1
≤ 1 TB

Measure 8.2.3
Ability to complete planned cyber-security actions per established schedule.

Target 8.2.3.1
The Laboratory will complete actions in Plans of Actions and Milestones (POA&Ms) on or ahead of schedule.

Measure 8.2.4
Continuous monitoring is performed by the Laboratory and reported to the DOE Designated Approval Authority (DAA).

Target 8.2.4.1
Each NIST system categorized as having moderate impact will have at least 90% of its moderate level controls assessed each fiscal year. Summary results will be provided to the DOE Designated Approval Authority (DAA) on an annual basis.

Measure 8.2.5
The Laboratory and Computer Security staff maintains awareness of their Cyber-Security responsibilities.

Target 8.2.5.1
90% of the Computer Security staff, Desktop Administrators, System Administrators, and computer users will complete role-specific computer security training each fiscal year.

8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, and Property

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The Contractor's success in meeting Safeguard goals and expectations;
- The commitment of leadership to strong Safeguards performance is appropriately demonstrated;
- Integration of Safeguards into the culture of the organization for effective deployment of the system is demonstrated; and
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of Safeguards risk identification, prevention, and control processes/activities.

The weight of this Objective is 10%.

Measure 8.3.1
Nuclear materials are accounted for and controlled in accordance with all relevant procedures.

Target 8.3.1.1
100% compliance with the current Laboratory Nuclear Materials Control and Accountability Program Implementation Plan.

Target 8.3.1.2
All Nuclear Material Control and Accountability (MC&A) Program and MC&A Procedures are updated to reflect current laboratory operations during the review period.

Measure 8.3.2
Employees, management and users maintain awareness of the Laboratory's designated Property Protection Areas (PPAs) and their associated security responsibilities related to PPAs access and wearing of badges.

Target 8.3.2.1
Planned quarterly walkthroughs by Laboratory security of PPAs find access card readers working properly and employees and users inside the PPAs wearing badges $\geq$ 97% of the time.

Measure 8.3.3
The Laboratory will perform the necessary interface activities with the current DOE prime security contractor.

Target: 8.3.3.1
The Laboratory provides effective support toward the management of DOE's prime security contract.

8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The Contractor's success in meeting protection of classified and sensitive information goals and expectations;
- The commitment of leadership to strong protection of classified and sensitive information performance is appropriately demonstrated;
- Integration of protection of classified and sensitive information into the culture of the organization for effective deployment of the system is demonstrated; and
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of protection of classified and sensitive information risk identification, prevention, and control processes/activities.

The weight of this Objective is 10%.

Measure 8.4.1
Provides an effective system for protection of any sensitive and technology transfer information and export control items.

Target 8.4.1.1
Maintains a list of any export control items that are in the Laboratory's possession and a list of any sensitive subjects, reports on any events involving protection of sensitive and technology transfer information or export control items, and mitigates these as necessary.

Measure 8.4.2
Provides information to employees regarding their responsibilities in support of the counterintelligence (CI) program.

Target 8.4.2.1
All Laboratory employees are provided an annual CI reporting requirements briefing and special annual CI presentations are made available for employees to attend.

Target 8.4.3
Provides an effective program for hosting Unclassified Foreign Visitors and Assignees (UFVAs).

Target 8.4.3.1
Provides hosts for UFVAs complete annual security briefings which prepare them to effectively perform their responsibilities.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM)					
8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System			40%		
8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security			40%		
8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, and Property			10%		
8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective CI System for the Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information			10%		
				Performance Goal 8.0 Total	

Table 8.1 – 8.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

Total Score	**4.3-4.1**	**4.0-3.8**	**3.7-3.5**	**3.4-3.1**	**3.0-2.8**	**2.7-2.5**	**2.4-2.1**	**2.0-1.8**	**1.7-1.1**	**1.0-0.8**	**0.7-0**
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 8.2 – 8.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

Attachment I

OFFICE OF SCIENCE PROGRAM OFFICE GOALS & OBJECTIVE WEIGHTINGS

	ASCR Weight	HEP Weight	WDTS Weight
Goal 1.0 Mission Accomplishment			
Goal's weight	**80%**	**25%**	**65%**
1.1 Impact (significance)	40%	30%	25%
1.2 Leadership (recognition of S&T accomplishments)	30%	30%	30%
1.3 Output (productivity)	15%	20%	30%
1.4 Delivery	15%	20%	15%
objectives check sum	100%	100%	100%
Goal 2.0 Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Facilities			
Goal's weight	**N/A**	**50%**	**N/A**
2.1 Design of Facility (the initiation phase and the definition phase, i.e. activities leading up to CD-2)		25%	
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)		25%	
2.3 Operation of Facility		50%	
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community		0%	
objective check sum	0%	100%	0%
Goal 3.0 Program Management			
Goal's weight	**20%**	**25%**	**35%**
3.1 Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Programmatic Vision	30%	40%	20%
3.2 Program Planning and Management	40%	40%	40%
3.3 Program Management-Communication & Responsiveness (to HQ)	30%	20%	40%
objectives check sum	100%	100%	100%
goal check sum	100%	100%	100%

ATTACHMENT II. TYPICAL EVALUATION SCHEDULE

Schedule for the evaluation of contractor performance, development of year-end evaluation reports, and their review, approval and final issuance to the contractor:

April	Site Offices conduct mid-year performance status review/meeting with the contractor with input from HQ Program Offices and other customers as appropriate
Third Week of September	Site Offices issue calls for year-end evaluation input (due to Site Offices by last week of November)
September 30	End of evaluation period
November 15	SC Program Office input on 1.0 – 3.0 due to Office of Laboratory Policy
Third Week of November	SC Program Office meeting with SC-2 to review Laboratory evaluation input for S&T Goals/Objectives (e.g., scores/grades & justifications)
Last Week of November	HQ Program Offices and other customer performance evaluation input due to Site Offices
Last Week of November	SC HQ Management and Program Office performance evaluation input for Goal 4.0 due to Site Office
January (one week prior to SC-1 Meetings)	Site Office Performance Evaluation Presentation for SC-1 due to SC Office of Laboratory Policy and Evaluation
First Week of January	Site Office meeting with SC-3 to review Laboratory evaluation input for M&O Goals/Objectives (e.g., scores/grades & justifications)
Third Week of January	Annual SC Laboratory Appraisal Meetings and Presentations to SC-1
Last Week of January	Site Office adjustments to evaluations finalized as necessary based on results of SC-1 presentation and SC-1 approvals issued
January 31	Approved Performance Evaluation Report and Incentive Determination issued to contractor
February 15	Report Cards published on SC Website